

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appellant:	Vijay V. SARASHETTI	§	Confirmation No.:	1087
		§		
Serial No.:	10/662,964	§	Group Art Unit:	2156
		§		
Filed:	09/12/2003	§	Examiner:	Truong V. Vo
		§		
For:	Representing Records	§	Docket No.:	200600636-1

APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents

Date: June 7, 2010

Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Appellant hereby submits this Appeal Brief in connection with the above-identified application. A Notice of Appeal was electronically filed on April 7, 2010.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	REAL PARTY IN INTEREST	3
II.	RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES	4
III.	STATUS OF THE CLAIMS	5
IV.	STATUS OF THE AMENDMENTS	6
V.	SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.....	7
VI.	GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL	12
VII.	ARGUMENT.....	13
A.	Whether the objections to claims 1, 17 and 21 are valid	13
B.	Whether claims 1-38 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over <i>Ang</i> in view of <i>Gibson</i>	13
1.	The <i>Ang</i> Reference.....	13
2.	The <i>Gibson</i> Reference.....	14
a)	Claims 1-8 and 27-29	14
b)	Claim 2	16
c)	Claims 6 and 7	17
d)	Claims 9-16 and 30-32	17
e)	Claim 10	18
f)	Claims 14 and 15	18
g)	Claims 17-20 and 33-35	18
h)	Claim 17	19
i)	Claims 21-23 and 36-38	19
j)	Claim 22	19
k)	Claims 24-26	19
l)	Claim 25	20
C.	Conclusion	20
VIII.	CLAIMS APPENDIX.....	21
IX.	EVIDENCE APPENDIX	33
X.	RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX	34

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is Hewlett-Packard Development Company, L.P. (HPDC), a Texas Limited Partnership, having its principal place of business in Houston, Texas. HPDC is a wholly owned affiliate of Hewlett-Packard Company (HPC). An Assignment from the inventor to APPIQ was recorded on March 31, 2004, at Reel/Frame 015157/0792. An Assignment from the inventor to APPIQ, Inc., was recorded on September 16, 2004, at Reel/Frame 015786/0050. A Merger document from AIPQ, Inc. to HPC was recorded on January 24, 2006, at Reel/Frame 017053/0592. An Assignment from HPC to HPDC was recorded July 28, 2006, at Reel/Frame 018022/0983.

Appl. No. 10/662,964
Appeal Brief dated June 7, 2010
Reply to final Office action of March 1, 2010

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellant is unaware of any related appeals or interferences.

III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Originally filed claims: 1-26.
Claim cancellations: 18.
Added claims: 27-38.
Presently pending claims: 1-17 and 19-38.
Presently appealed claims: 1-17 and 19-38.

Appl. No. 10/662,964
Appeal Brief dated June 7, 2010
Reply to final Office action of March 1, 2010

IV. STATUS OF THE AMENDMENTS

An Amendment after Notice of Appeal but before filing Appeal Brief was electronically filed with the PTO on June 7, 2010. The claims presented in the Claims Appendix assume entry of those claim amendments.

V. SUMMARY OF THE CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

This section provides a concise explanation of the subject matter defined in each of the independent claims, referring to the specification by page and line number or to the drawings by reference characters as required by 37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v). Each element of the claims is identified with a corresponding reference to the specification or drawings where applicable. The specification references are made to the application as filed by Appellant. Note that the citation to passages in the specification or drawings for each claim element does not imply that the limitations from the specification and drawings should be read into the corresponding claim element. Also note that these specific references are not exclusive; there may be additional support for the subject matter elsewhere in the specification and drawings.

Appellant's disclosure describes methods and system for representing records. At least some illustrative embodiments are methods as in claim 1:

1. A computer implemented method for representing records, the method comprising:
 - receiving an order for a transaction at a record collection site **{12, Fig. 1}**;¹
 - producing a record **{38, Fig. 1}** that represents the transaction at the record collection site **{12}**;²
 - storing the record **{38}** in a memory location in a computer readable storage medium **{32, Fig. 1}** at the record collection site **{12}**;³
 - assigning a unique identifier to the record **{38}** stored at the record collection site **{12, 14, 16}**;⁴
 - entering the unique identifier **{92, 116; Fig. 3}** in a hierarchical tree structure **{40, Fig. 1}** stored in a computer readable storage medium **{32}** at the record collection site **{12}**, wherein the unique identifier comprises information for accessing the record in the memory location, and wherein the tree structure **{40}** comprises a plurality of branches connected by nodes;⁵ and

¹ See at least Fig. 1; lines 19-21 of page 3; lines 28-30 of page 3; and lines 27-29 of page 12.

² See at least Fig. 1; line 30, page 3 – line 2 of page 4; and lines 10-14 of page 4.

³ See at least Fig. 1 and lines 1-3 of page 4.

⁴ See at least Figs. 1 and 3; lines 10-14 of page 4; and lines 23-27 of page 10.

⁵ See at least Figs. 1 and 3; lines 14-17 of page 4; and lines 23-31 of page 10.

sending the hierarchical tree structure {40} to a central storage site {18, Fig. 1} that is separate from the record collection site {12};⁶ and
receiving requests from the central storage site {18} to access records at the record collection site {12} in accordance with the hierarchical tree structure {40} sent to the central storage site {18}.⁷

Other illustrative embodiments are computer program products as in claim 9:

9. A computer program product, recorded in a computer-readable storage medium comprising logic instructions which, when executed on a processor, cause the processor to:

collect orders for a plurality of transactions at a record collection site {12, Fig. 1};⁸

produce a record {38, Fig. 1} for each of the transactions at the record collection site {12};⁹

store the records {38} in a memory location {32, Fig. 1} at the record collection site {12};¹⁰

assign a unique identifier {92, 116; Fig. 3} to each of said records {38} stored at the record collection site {12};¹¹

enter the unique identifiers {92, 116} in a hierarchical tree structure {40, Fig. 1} stored at the record collection site {12}, wherein each unique identifier {92, 116} comprises information for accessing a corresponding record in the memory location {32}, and wherein the tree structure {40} comprises a plurality of branches connected by nodes;¹² and

send an aggregate report {58a, Fig. 2} of record type counts at the record collection site {12} based on the unique identifiers {92, 116} in the hierarchical tree structure {40}, the aggregate report {58a} being sent to a central storage site {18, Fig. 1} that is separate from the record collection site {12}.¹³

⁶ See at least Fig. 1; lines 16-19 of page 5; and lines 5-7 of page 7.

⁷ See at least Fig. 1 and lines 26-30 of page 7.

⁸ See at least Fig. 1; lines 19-21 of page 3; lines 28-30 of page 3; and lines 27-29 of page 12.

⁹ See at least Fig. 1; line 30, page 3 – line 2 of page 4; and lines 10-14 of page 4.

¹⁰ See at least Fig. 1 and lines 1-3 of page 4.

¹¹ See at least Figs. 1 and 3; lines 10-14 of page 4; and lines 23-27 of page 10.

¹² See at least Figs. 1 and 3; lines 14-17 of page 4; and lines 23-31 of page 10.

¹³ See at least Figs. 1 and 2; lines 4-14 of page 6; and lines 27-28 of page 13.

Still other illustrative embodiments are methods as in claim 17:

17. A computer implemented method for representing records, the method comprising:

receiving an order for a transaction at a record collection site {12, Fig. 1};¹⁴

producing a record {38, Fig. 1} that represents the transaction at the record collection site {12};¹⁵

storing the record {38} in a computer readable storage medium {32, Fig. 1} in a memory location at the record collection site {12};¹⁶

assigning a unique identifier {92, 116; Fig. 3} to the record {38} stored at the record collection site {12};¹⁷

entering the unique identifier {92, 116} in a hierarchical tree structure {40, Fig. 1} stored in a computer readable storage medium {32} at the record collection site {12}, wherein the unique identifier {92, 116} comprises information for accessing the record {38} in the memory location, and wherein the tree structure {40} comprises a plurality of branches connected by nodes;¹⁸

sending the hierarchical tree structure {40} to a central storage site {18, Fig. 1} that is separate from the record collection site {12};¹⁹

receiving requests from the central storage site {18} to access records at the record collection site {12} in accordance with the hierarchical tree structure {40} sent to the central storage site {18};²⁰ and

using the unique identifier {92, 116} to access the record {38} stored at the record collection site {12}.²¹

¹⁴ See at least Fig. 1; lines 19-21 of page 3; lines 28-30 of page 3; and lines 27-29 of page 12.

¹⁵ See at least Fig. 1; line 30, page 3 – line 2 of page 4; and lines 10-14 of page 4.

¹⁶ See at least Fig. 1 and lines 1-3 of page 4.

¹⁷ See at least Figs. 1 and 3; lines 10-14 of page 4; and lines 23-27 of page 10.

¹⁸ See at least Figs. 1 and 3; lines 14-17 of page 4; and lines 23-31 of page 10.

¹⁹ See at least Fig. 1; lines 16-19 of page 5; and lines 5-7 of page 7.

²⁰ See at least Fig. 1 and lines 26-30 of page 7.

²¹ *Id.*

Still other illustrative embodiments are methods as in claim 21:

21. A computer implemented method for representing records, the method comprising:

receiving an order for a transaction at a record collection site **{12, Fig. 1}**;²²

producing a record **{38, Fig. 1}** that represents the transaction at the record collection site **{12}**;²³

storing the record **{38}** in a computer readable storage medium **{32, Fig. 1}** in a memory location at the record collection site **{12}**;²⁴

assigning a unique identifier **{92, 116; Fig. 3}** to the record **{38}** stored at the record collection site **{12}**;²⁵

entering the unique identifier **{92, 116}** in a hierarchical tree structure **{40, Fig. 1}** in a computer readable storage medium **{32}** at the record collection site **{12}**, wherein the unique identifier **{92, 116}** comprises information for accessing the record **{38}** in the memory location, and wherein the tree structure **{40}** comprises a plurality of branches connected by nodes;²⁶ and

sending the hierarchical tree structure **{40}** to a central storage site **{18, Fig. 1}** that is separate from the record collection site **{12}** to enable the central storage site **{18}** to access the record corresponding to the unique identifier **{92, 116}** in the hierarchical tree structure **{40}**.²⁷

²² See at least Fig. 1; lines 19-21 of page 3; lines 28-30 of page 3; and lines 27-29 of page 12.

²³ See at least Fig. 1; line 30, page 3 – line 2 of page 4; and lines 10-14 of page 4.

²⁴ See at least Fig. 1 and lines 1-3 of page 4.

²⁵ See at least Figs. 1 and 3; lines 10-14 of page 4; and lines 23-27 of page 10.

²⁶ See at least Figs. 1 and 3; lines 14-17 of page 4; and lines 23-31 of page 10.

²⁷ See at least Fig. 1; lines 16-19 of page 5; and lines 5-7 of page 7.

Still other illustrative embodiments are methods as in claim 24:

24. A system comprising:
a record collection site **{12, Fig. 1}** that includes a computer system **{26, Fig. 1}** comprising logic instructions recorded on a computer readable storage medium which, when executed on computer system **{26}**, cause the computer system **{26}** to assign a unique identifier **{92, 116; Fig. 3}** to a record **{38, Fig. 1}** stored at the record collection site **{12}** and enter the unique identifier **{92, 116}** in a hierarchical tree structure **{40, Fig. 1}**;²⁸ and
a central storage site **{18, Fig. 1}** remote from the record collection site **{12, Fig. 1}**, the central storage site **{18}** includes a computer system **{60, Fig. 1}** comprising logic instructions recorded on a computer readable storage medium which, when executed on computer system **{60}**, cause the computer system **{60}** to receive the hierarchical tree structure **{40}** from the record collection site **{12}** and to selectively access the record **{38}** being stored in the record collection site **{12}** using the unique identifier **{92, 116}**.²⁹

²⁸ See at least Fig. 1; line 28 of page 3 – line 16 of page 4.

²⁹ See at least Fig. 1; lines 5-10 of page 7; and lines 26-30 of page 7.

VI. GROUNDS OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

Whether the objections to claims 1, 17 and 21 are valid.

Whether claims 1-38 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0030656 ("*Ang*") in view of U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0030607 ("*Gibson*").

VII. ARGUMENT

A. Whether the objections to claims 1, 17 and 21 are valid

The Examiner objected to claims 1, 17 and 21 as being substantial duplicates of each other. Various limitations of claims 1, 17 and 21 are recited herein for convenience.

Claim 1 – “receiving requests from the central storage cite to access records at the record collection site in accordance with the hierarchical tree structure sent to the central storage site.”

Claim 17 – “receiving requests from the central storage cite to access records at the record collection site in accordance with the hierarchical tree structure sent to the central storage site; and
using the unique identifier to access the record stored at the record collection site.”

Claim 21 - “sending the hierarchical tree structure to a central storage site that is separate from the record collection site to enable the central storage site to access the record corresponding to the unique identifier in the hierarchical tree structure.”

Claims 1 and 21 do not recite the limitation “using the unique identifier to access the record stored at the record collection site” as is required is claim 17. Further, claim 21 does not recite the limitation “receiving requests from the central storage cite” as is required in claims 1 and 17. Thus, the scope of claims 1, 17 and 21 are different and these claims are not duplicate claims. For at least these reasons, Appellant respectfully requests that the objection to claims 1, 17, and 21 being duplicates be reversed.

B. Whether claims 1-38 are obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over *Ang* in view of *Gibson*

1. The *Ang* Reference

Ang describes a technique for preparing a portable device database that is compatible with a particular portable device. The data in the portable device database is extracted from a source database and is formatted for the operating system (OS) requirements and processing capabilities of a particular portable device. See paragraphs [0015] and [0044]. The rendering and viewing program

arranges and links the data in the portable device database to facilitate navigation of the data by a user of the portable device. See at least paragraph [0049].

2. The *Gibson* Reference

Gibson describes a transaction processing system in which a customer location, a merchant location, and a transaction processing location are separate entities. See Fig. 1. In *Gibson*, an order may be placed through a merchant website, but the transaction is later processed by the processing system. See Fig. 2. Alternatively, a customer may order/pay for an item via the processing system, and the processing system handles the transaction with the merchant. See Fig. 3. The merchant system and the processing system utilize different transaction identifiers (TRN and TRR) to complete or verify pending transactions. See paragraphs [0047] and [0050].

a) Claims 1-8 and 27-29

Claim 1 describes two entities: “a record collection site” and “a central storage site that is separate from the record collection site.” In claim 1, various steps are performed in reference to the claimed “record collection site” and “central storage site.” More specifically, claim 1 recites “receiving an order for a transaction at a record collection site” **{limitation 1}**, “producing a record that represents the transaction at the record collection site” **{limitation 2}** and “storing the record in a memory location in a computer readable storage medium at the record collection site” **{limitation 3}**. Besides receiving an order and storing a corresponding record at the record collection site, claim 1 further requires “assigning a unique identifier to the record stored at the record collection site” **{limitation 4}** and “entering the unique identifier in a hierarchical tree structure stored in a computer readable storage medium at the record collection site, wherein the unique identifier comprises information for accessing the record in the memory location” **{limitation 5}**. Claim 1 further requires “sending the hierarchical tree structure to a central storage site that is separate from the record collection site” **{limitation 6}** and “receiving requests from the central storage cite to access records at the record collection site in accordance

with the hierarchical tree structure sent to the central storage site {**limitation 7**}.

The combination of *Ang* and *Gibson* do not teach limitations 1-7 of claim 1. To summarize, the steps described in *Ang* and *Gibson* are not related to “a record collection site” and “a central storage site” in the manner required in claim 1. More specifically, the Examiner cites *Ang* as teaching limitations 4 and 5 at paragraph [0049]. See Final Office Action dated 03/01/10, page 3, last paragraph. *Ang*’s paragraph [0049] describes a text builder program on a portable device that reads a portable device database and organizes/links the information in the database for presentation via a viewer. See paragraphs [0049]-[0051]. Even assuming, *arguendo*, that *Ang* teaches assigning and entering unique identifiers in a hierarchical tree structure, *Ang*’s assignment and entering of unique identifiers does not occur on the same device that receives an order for a transaction and stores a corresponding record. Further, *Ang*’s unique identifiers are not even related to transaction records as in claim 1.

The Examiner also cites *Ang* at paragraph [0029] as teaching limitation 6 of claim 1. See Final Office Action dated 03/01/10, page 5, first full paragraph. *Ang*’s paragraph [0029] simply mentions a central database 105, not the portable device database and its hierarchical tree layout. The central database 105 only provides data that is eventually formatted as the portable device database and is not formatted with the hierarchical tree layout as is the portable device database. To teach limitation 6 of claim 1, *Ang* would have to teach sending the hierarchical tree layout of the portable device database back to the central database 105. *Ang* has no such teaching and is therefore deficient.

Further, the Examiner also cites *Ang* at paragraphs [0034], [0047]-[0049], and [0058] as teaching limitation 7 of claim 1. See Final Office Action dated 03/01/10, page 5, second full paragraph to page 6. There is no evidence in *Ang* of the specific requirements of limitation 7. In other words, *Ang* lacks a first entity (for comparison to Appellant’s claimed “central storage site”) that receives a hierarchical tree structure from a second entity (for comparison to Appellant’s claimed “record collection site”) and then requests to access records stored on

the second entity. There is no such interaction between any two of *Ang*'s components.

Further, the Examiner concedes that *Ang* does not teach limitation 1 and relies on *Gibson* to support the obviousness rejection. Although *Gibson* mentions a transaction and records for a merchant and a payment processing system, *Gibson* does overcome the deficiencies of *Ang*. To summarize, there is no "record collection site" in *Ang*, *Gibson*, or the combination thereof, that performs all of limitations 1-5 as in claim 1. Further, there is no interaction between any two entities in *Ang*, *Gibson*, or the combination thereof, comparable to the interaction between the claimed "record collection side" and "central storage site" in limitations 6 and 7 of claim 1.

Combining the teachings of *Ang* with the teachings of *Gibson* does not result in the specific limitations of claim 1. Rather than teach Appellant's claimed limitations 1-7, the combination of *Ang* and *Gibson* would result in *Gibson*'s private transaction information being organized for display on portable devices as in *Ang*. There is no evidence that extending *Ang*'s technique to include transaction information as in *Gibson* results in limitations 1-7 of claim 1. To summarize, the extension of transaction information to *Ang*'s technique does not result in a single entity performing limitations 1-5 as in claim 1 and does not result in the interaction of two entities as in limitations 6-7 of claim 1. Due to the deficiencies of the cited references, Appellant submits that obviousness allegations against claim 1 in view of *Ang* and *Gibson* are conclusory and/or are based on improper hindsight reasoning. Based on the foregoing, Appellant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejections of claims 1-8 as being obvious over *Ang* and *Gibson* be reversed and the claims be set to issue.

b) Claim 2

Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and is allowable for the same reasons as given for claim 1. In addition, claim 2 requires "using the unique identifier to produce an aggregate report of records collected by the record collection site" and "sending the aggregate report to the central storage site." The Examiner cites *Ang* at paragraph [0047] as teaching the above limitations. See Final

Office Action dated 03/01/10, page 7, item 9. *Ang*'s paragraph [0047] (and *Ang* in general) is directed to a process of formatting data in a central database for use with a portable device. In *Ang*, there is no production of aggregate reports of transaction-related records at a record collection site and subsequent transfer of the aggregate reports to a central storage site as in claim 2. *Gibson* is likewise deficient in this regard. For at least these additional reasons, claim 2 is allowable over *Ang* and *Gibson*.

c) Claims 6 and 7

Claims 6 and 7 depend from claims 1 and 2, and are allowable for the same reasons as given for claims 1 and 2. In addition, claims 6 and 7 recite specific limitations related to the claimed "aggregate reports." *Ang* and *Gibson* do not each teach aggregate reports of transaction-related records and much less the specific limitations of claims 6 and 7 regarding how aggregate reports are produced. For at least these additional reasons, claims 6 and 7 are allowable over *Ang* and *Gibson*.

d) Claims 9-16 and 30-32

Claim 9, in part, requires "a computer program product" that causes a processor to "collect orders for a plurality of transactions at a record collection site," "produce a record for each of the transactions at the record collection site," "store the records in a memory location at the record collection site," "assign a unique identifier to each of said records stored at the record collection site" and "enter the unique identifiers in a hierarchical tree structure stored at the record collection site, wherein each unique identifier comprises information for accessing a corresponding record in the memory location, and wherein the tree structure comprises a plurality of branches connected by nodes." The above limitations of claim 9 are similar to limitations 1-5 of claim 1 discussed previously and thus claim 9 is allowable for much the same reasons as given for claim 1.

Further, claim 9 requires "send[ing] an aggregate report of record type counts at the record collection site based on the unique identifiers in the hierarchical tree structure, the aggregate report being sent to a central storage site that is separate from the record collection site." The Examiner cites the

rejection of claim 1 as being applicable to claim 9. However, the Examiner has not addressed the specific aggregate report limitations of claim 9. Based on the foregoing, Appellant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejections of claims 9-16 and 30-32 as being obvious over *Ang* and *Gibson* be reversed and the claims be set to issue.

e) Claim 10

Claim 10 depends from claim 9 and is allowable for the same reasons as given for claim 9. In addition, claim 10 is allowable for much the same reasons as given for claim 2.

f) Claims 14 and 15

Claims 14 and 15 depend from claims 9 and 10, and are allowable for the same reasons as given for claims 9 and 10. In addition, claims 14 and 15 are allowable for much the same reasons as given for claims 6 and 7.

g) Claims 17-20 and 33-35

Claim 17 requires much the same limitations as those discussed for claim 1 (limitations 1-7) and is allowable for much the same reasons as given for claim 1. In addition claim 17 requires “using the unique identifier to access the record stored at the record collection site.” The Examiner cited *Ang* at paragraph [0047] as teaching the above limitations. See Final Office Action dated 03/01/10, page 11, item 25 referring to page 7, item 10. *Ang*’s paragraph [0047] describes a map to correlate unique identifiers of a central database with sequential index used for a portable device. However, *Ang*’s map is not used to access records stored in a record collection site as in claim 17. Instead, *Ang*’s map is used to convert data from the central database to the portable device database. After the portable device database is created, there is no need for the central database to access the portable device database or vice versa. Based on the foregoing, Appellant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejections of claims 17-20 and 33-35 as being obvious over *Ang* and *Gibson* be reversed and the claims be set to issue.

h) Claim 17

Claim 19 depends from claim 17 and is allowable for the same reasons as given for claim 17. In addition, claim 19 is allowable for much the same reasons as given for claim 2.

i) Claims 21-23 and 36-38

Claim 21 requires much the same limitations as those discussed for claim 1 (limitations 1-6) and is allowable for much the same reasons as given for claim 1. Based on the foregoing, Appellant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejections of claims 21-23 and 36-38 as being obvious over *Ang* and *Gibson* be reversed and the claims be set to issue.

j) Claim 22

Claim 22 depends from claim 21 and is allowable for the same reasons as given for claim 21. In addition, claim 22 is allowable for much the same reasons as given for claim 2.

k) Claims 24-26

Claim 24, in part, requires “a record collection site that includes a computer system comprising logic instructions recorded on a computer readable storage medium which, when executed on computer system, cause the computer system to assign a unique identifier to a record stored at the record collection site and enter the unique identifier in a hierarchical tree structure” and “a central storage site remote from the record collection site, the central storage site includes a computer system comprising logic instructions recorded on a computer readable storage medium which, when executed on computer system, cause the computer system to receive the hierarchical tree structure from the record collection site and to selectively access the record being stored in the record collection site using the unique identifier.” The recited limitations of claim 24 are similar to limitations 4-7 of claim 1 and thus claim 24 is allowable over *Ang* and *Gibson* for much the same reasons as given for claim 1. Based on the foregoing, Appellant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejections of claims 24-26 as being obvious over *Ang* and *Gibson* be reversed and the claims be set to issue.

I) Claim 25

Claim 25 depends from claim 24 and is allowable for the same reasons as given for claim 24. In addition, claim 25 is allowable for much the same reasons as given for claim 2.

C. Conclusion

For the reasons stated above, Appellant respectfully submits that the Examiner erred in rejecting all pending claims. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alan D. Christenson/

Alan D. Christenson
PTO Reg. No. 54,036
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANT

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
3404 E. Harmony Road
Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. A computer implemented method for representing records, the method comprising:

receiving an order for a transaction at a record collection site;

producing a record that represents the transaction at the record collection site;

storing the record in a memory location in a computer readable storage medium at the record collection site;

assigning a unique identifier to the record stored at the record collection site;

entering the unique identifier in a hierarchical tree structure stored in a computer readable storage medium at the record collection site, wherein the unique identifier comprises information for accessing the record in the memory location, and wherein the tree structure comprises a plurality of branches connected by nodes; and

sending the hierarchical tree structure to a central storage site that is separate from the record collection site; and

receiving requests from the central storage site to access records at the record collection site in accordance with the hierarchical tree structure sent to the central storage site.

2. The method of claim 1 further comprising:
using the unique identifier to produce an aggregate report of records collected by the record collection site; and
sending the aggregate report to the central storage site.
3. The method of claim 1 further comprising:
using the unique identifier at the central storage site to access the record stored at the record collection site.
4. The method of claim 1, wherein the unique identifier includes information representing a node located in the hierarchical tree structure.
5. The method of claim 4, wherein the node is located in a higher position of the hierarchical tree structure than the unique identifier.
6. The method of claim 2, wherein using the unique identifier to produce the aggregate report includes counting the unique identifier with a second unique identifier assigned to a second record stored at the record collection site.
7. The method of claim 2, wherein using the unique identifier to produce an aggregate report includes summing data included in the record accessed by the unique identifier with data included in a second record accessed by a second unique identifier.

8. The method of claim 4, wherein a unique key that includes information representing a second node in the hierarchical tree structure is assigned to the node.

9. A computer program product, recorded in a computer-readable storage medium comprising logic instructions which, when executed on a processor, cause the processor to:

- collect orders for a plurality of transactions at a record collection site;
- produce a record for each of the transactions at the record collection site;
- store the records in a memory location at the record collection site;
- assign a unique identifier to each of said records stored at the record collection site;

- enter the unique identifiers in a hierarchical tree structure stored at the record collection site, wherein each unique identifier comprises information for accessing a corresponding record in the memory location, and wherein the tree structure comprises a plurality of branches connected by nodes; and

- send an aggregate report of record type counts at the record collection site based on the unique identifiers in the hierarchical tree structure, the aggregate report being sent to a central storage site that is separate from the record collection site.

10. The computer program product of claim 9, further comprising logic instructions recorded on the computer readable storage medium which, when executed on the processor, cause the processor to:

use the unique identifier to produce an aggregate report of records collected by the record collection site; and

send the aggregate report to a central storage site.

11. The computer program product of claim 9, further comprising logic instructions recorded on the computer readable storage medium which, when executed on the processor, cause the processor to:

use the unique identifier at the central storage site to access the record stored at the record collection site.

12. The computer program product of claim 9, wherein the unique identifier includes information representing a node located in the hierarchical tree structure.

13. The computer program product of claim 12, wherein the node is located in a higher position of the hierarchical tree structure than the unique identifier.

14. The computer program product of claim 10, further comprising logic instructions recorded on the computer readable storage medium which, when executed on the processor, cause the processor to count the unique identifier

with a second unique identifier assigned to a second record stored in at the record collection site.

15. The computer program product of claim 10, further comprising logic instructions which, when executed on the processor, cause the processor to sum data included in the record accessed by the unique identifier with data included in a second record accessed by a second unique identifier.

16. The computer program product of claim 12, wherein a unique key that includes information representing a second node in the hierarchical tree structure is assigned to the node.

17. A computer implemented method for representing records, the method comprising:

receiving an order for a transaction at a record collection site;

producing a record that represents the transaction at the record collection site;

storing the record in a computer readable storage medium in a memory location at the record collection site;

assigning a unique identifier to the record stored at the record collection site;

entering the unique identifier in a hierarchical tree structure stored in a computer readable storage medium at the record collection site, wherein the

unique identifier comprises information for accessing the record in the memory location, and wherein the tree structure comprises a plurality of branches connected by nodes;

sending the hierarchical tree structure to a central storage site that is separate from the record collection site;

receiving requests from the central storage site to access records at the record collection site in accordance with the hierarchical tree structure sent to the central storage site; and

using the unique identifier to access the record stored at the record collection site.

19. The method of claim 17 further comprising: receiving an aggregate report at the central storage site produced at the record collection site using the unique identifier.

20. The method of claim 17, wherein the unique identifier includes information representing a node located in the hierarchical tree structure.

21. A computer implemented method for representing records, the method comprising:

receiving an order for a transaction at a record collection site;

producing a record that represents the transaction at the record collection site;

storing the record in a computer readable storage medium in a memory location at the record collection site;

assigning a unique identifier to the record stored at the record collection site;

entering the unique identifier in a hierarchical tree structure in a computer readable storage medium at the record collection site, wherein the unique identifier comprises information for accessing the record in the memory location, and wherein the tree structure comprises a plurality of branches connected by nodes; and

sending the hierarchical tree structure to a central storage site that is separate from the record collection site to enable the central storage site to access the record corresponding to the unique identifier in the hierarchical tree structure.

22. The method of claim 21, wherein the unique identifier at the record collection site is used to produce an aggregate report that is sent to the central storage site.

23. The method of claim 21, wherein the unique identifier includes information representing a node located in the hierarchical tree structure.

24. A system comprising:

a record collection site that includes a computer system comprising logic instructions recorded on a computer readable storage medium which, when executed on computer system, cause the computer system to assign a unique identifier to a record stored at the record collection site and enter the unique identifier in a hierarchical tree structure; and

a central storage site remote from the record collection site, the central storage site includes a computer system comprising logic instructions recorded on a computer readable storage medium which, when executed on computer system, cause the computer system to receive the hierarchical tree structure from the record collection site and to selectively access the record being stored in the record collection site using the unique identifier.

25. The system of claim 24, wherein the computer system at the record collection site further comprises logic instructions recorded on a computer readable storage medium which, when executed on computer system, cause the computer system to use the unique identifier to produce an aggregate report and initiate transmission of the aggregate report to the central storage site.

26. The system of claim 24, wherein the unique identifier includes information representing a node located in the hierarchical tree structure.

27. The method of claim 1, wherein assigning a unique identifier to a record stored at a record collection site comprises:

producing a record at the record collection site;

producing a unique identifier for the record to allow the record to be identified, distinguished and accessed from the record collection site;

assigning a unique identifier to the record so that the record is distinguishable from other records produced at the record collection site; and

entering the unique identifier assigned to the record into a tree structure which is also stored at the record collection site.

28. The method of claim 27, wherein tree structure identifiers are assigned to similar record types and are grouped together thereby improving accessibility for the stored records.

29. The method of claim 28, wherein the tree structure is produced with a database software package capable of storing data in a balanced tree structure.

30. The computer program product of claim 9, further comprising logic instructions recorded on the computer readable storage medium which, when executed on the processor, cause the processor to:

produce a record at the record collection site;

produce a unique identifier for the record to allow the record to be identified, distinguished and accessed from the record collection site;

assign a unique identifier to the record so that the record is distinguishable from other records produced at the record collection site; and

enter the unique identifier assigned to the record into a tree structure which is also stored at the record collection site.

31. The computer program product of claim 30, wherein tree structure identifiers are assigned to similar record types and are grouped together thereby improving accessibility for the stored records.

32. The computer program product of claim 31, wherein the tree structure is produced with a database software package capable of storing data in a balanced tree structure.

33. The method of claim 17, wherein assigning a unique identifier to a record stored at a record collection site comprises:

producing a record at the record collection site;

producing a unique identifier for the record to allow the record to be identified, distinguished and accessed from the record collection site;

assigning a unique identifier to the record so that the record is distinguishable from other records produced at the record collection site; and

entering the unique identifier assigned to the record into a tree structure which is also stored at the record collection site.

34. The method of claim 33, wherein tree structure identifiers are assigned to similar record types and are grouped together thereby improving accessibility for the stored records.

35. The method of claim 34, wherein the tree structure is produced with a database software package capable of storing data in a balanced tree structure.

36. The system of claim 24, wherein a record collection site that includes a computer system that further comprises logic instructions recorded on a computer readable storage medium which, when executed on computer system, cause the computer system to:

- produce a record at the record collection site;

- produce a unique identifier for the record to allow the record to be identified, distinguished and accessed from the record collection site;

- assign a unique identifier to the record so that the record is distinguishable from other records produced at the record collection site; and

- enter the unique identifier assigned to the record into a tree structure which is also stored at the record collection site.

37. The method of claim 36, wherein tree structure identifiers are assigned to similar record types and are grouped together thereby improving accessibility for the stored records.

38. The method of claim 37, wherein the tree structure is produced with a database software package capable of storing data in a balanced tree structure.

Appl. No. 10/662,964
Appeal Brief dated June 7, 2010
Reply to final Office action of March 1, 2010

IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

None.

Appl. No. 10/662,964
Appeal Brief dated June 7, 2010
Reply to final Office action of March 1, 2010

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

None.